



Aethiopica 3 (2000)

International Journal of Ethiopian and
Eritrean Studies

PAOLO MARRASSINI

Article

Some philological problems in the “Miracles” of Gabra Manfas Qeddus

Aethiopica 3 (2000), 45–78

ISSN: 1430–1938

Published by

Universität Hamburg

Asien Afrika Institut, Abteilung Afrikanistik und Äthiopistik

Hiob Ludolf Zentrum für Äthiopistik

Some philological problems in the “Miracles” of Gabra Manfas Qeddus

PAOLO MARRASSINI

The present writer is preparing a critical edition of the “Life” and the “Miracles” of Gabra Manfas Qeddus for the *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium* of Louvain.¹ This is in fact *only a first attempt* towards a *complete* critical edition, because, for brevity’s sake, only fifteen manuscripts, out of about a hundred, have been examined, i. e. all the mss. older than the 17th century. Others will produce the complete edition of this text in the future; for the time being, I thought it interesting to publish the results of my provisional edition, above all because of the fact that in the “Miracles” not only is there a genealogical tree which is different from that of the “Life”, but also in these same “Miracles” there is not merely a single genealogical tree (*stemma*), but *no less than six* different stemmata can be individuated, each for a different group of miracles.

This, in my opinion, is of the highest interest, and very clearly demonstrates, from a strictly philological point of view, something which was already widely known in hagiography from the aspect of history and literature, namely, that the “Miracles” were in most cases written independently of the “Life”, and are the result of a different tradition. Leaving to a further contribution the study of the concrete historical and cultural situation that gave rise to such a phenomenon in the hagiographical tradition about Gabra Manfas Qeddus (monasteries, *scriptoria* and so on), we can limit ourselves now to the strictly philological aspects of this problem.

Of course, the philological method utilized in the following will be the so-called “neo-Lachmannian” method, based (like the “old-Lachmannian”) on

¹ Cf. the German résumé by C. BEZOLD, Abbā Gabra Manfas Qeddus, in: *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft zu Göttingen, Phil.-hist. Klasse*, 1916, 58–68, and the edition of the Miracles (based on three mss.) by G. NOLLET, *Les Miracles de Gabra Manfas Qeddus*, *Aethiops* 4 (1931) 33–36, 39; *Aethiopica* 1 (1933) 41–47, 64–73; 2 (1934) 37–43, 70–81; 3 (1935) 109–114, 162–170; there is also an Ethiopian edition in Gəʿəz and in Amharic by TASFÄ GABRA SELLASE, printed in Addis Ababa in 1954 A. M.

the presence of conjunctive errors (always integrated, as far as possible, with criteria of internal evidence), and not that of the similarities of marginal readings in the manuscripts. This principle, to my mind, appears to be so obvious that I do not find it necessary to discuss it here at length.²

The manuscripts utilized for our edition have already been indicated by the present writer in a paper read at the Ninth International Conference of Ethiopian Studies in Moscow in 1986.³ For convenience's sake they are briefly repeated here in the alphabetical order of the abbreviations (the Moscow abbreviations are in brackets and in inverted commas):

² Perhaps some not very sophisticated bibliographical indications (mostly of English works) will suffice here. As general introductions in English: L. BIELER, *The grammarian's craft. An introduction to textual criticism*, New York, The Catholic Classical Association 1965 [from the article by the same author: The grammarian's craft: A professional talk, *Classical Folia* 10, 1958, 3–42]; W. A. DEARING, *A manual of textual analysis*, Berkeley-Los Angeles, The University of California Press 1959; A. FOULET - M. B. SPEER, *On editing Old French texts*, Lawrence, The Regent Press of Kansas 1979; F. W. HALL, *A companion to classical texts*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press 1913 [reprints Hildesheim, G. Olms 1968 and Chicago, Argonaut 1970]; E. J. KENNEY, *The classical texts*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, The University of California Press 1974; E. J. KENNEY, Textual criticism, in *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 18, 1978, 189–195; CH. KLEINHENZ, *Medieval manuscripts and textual criticism*, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1976 [a collection of essays written in various languages]; P. MAAS, *Textual criticism*, Oxford 1958 (transl. of the 3rd edition see below); A. H. MCD[ONALD], Textual criticism, in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1970²; L. D. REYNOLDS (ed.), *Texts and transmission. A survey of the Latin classics*, Oxford, At the Clarendon Press 1983; M. L. WEST, *Textual criticism and editorial technique applicable to Greek and Latin texts*, Stuttgart, Teubner 1973; J. WILLIS, *Latin textual criticism*, Urbana-Chicago-London, University of Illinois Press 1972. Classic works: J. BÉDIER, La tradition manuscrite du “Lai de l'ombre”. Réflexions sur l'art d'éditer les anciens textes, *Romania* 54 (1928) 161–196, 321–356; A. CASTELLANI, *Bédier avait-il raison? La méthode de Lachmann dans les éditions de textes du moyen âge*, Fribourg 1957; G. CONTINI, *Breviario di ecdotica*, Napoli, Ricciardi 1986; A. DAIN, *Les manuscrits*, Paris 1949, 1964²; J. FROGER, dom, *La critique des textes et son automatisation*, Paris 1968; P. MAAS, *Textkritik*, Leipzig 1927, 1950², 1957³, 1960⁴; Italian translation Firenze, Sansoni 1952, 1980; English translation see above; G. PASQUALI, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze, Sansoni 1934, 1952², 1988³; H. QUENTIN, dom, *Essai de critique textuelle (Ecdotique)*, Paris 1926; S. TIMPANARO, *La genesi del metodo del Lachmann*, Padova Liviana 1963, 1981² (German edition, *Die Entstehung der Lachmannschen Methode*, Hamburg, Buske 1971).

³ Published in P. MARRASSINI, La “Vie” de Gabra Manfas Qeddus. Hypothèse pour un stemma codicum, in: *Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies*, Moscow, 26–29 August 1986, VI, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, Central Department of Oriental Literature, 1988, 135–148.

1. A¹ (“d’A 126”) = D’ABBADIE 126 (*Notice* 174)⁴
2. A² (“d’A 36”) = D’ABBADIE 36 (*Notice* 179, pp. 189–190)
3. B¹ (“Or 711”) = British Library Oriental 711 (Wright 286)⁵
4. B² (“BL Add.”) = British Library Add. 16.198 (Dillmann 48)⁶
5. C (“Vat Cer”) = CERULLI Etiopico 227⁷
6. E¹ (“EMML 2087”) = EMML 2087⁸
7. E² (“EMML 2300”) = EMML 2300⁹
8. E³ (not yet examined at that time) = EMML 2084¹⁰
9. E⁴ (not yet examined at that time) = EMML 2559¹¹
10. G (not yet examined at that time) = Griaule Bibliothèque Nationale 684¹²
11. L (“CR”) = CONTI ROSSINI (Lincei) 103¹³
12. M (not yet examined at that time) = Berlin Or. Oct. 555 (HAMMERSCHMIDT - SIX n. 2),¹⁴ sometime also in Marburg¹⁵
13. V¹ (“Vatican 142”) = Vaticana 142¹⁶
14. V² (“Vatican 232”) = Vaticana 232¹⁷
15. W (“Wien”) = Wien 23¹⁸

⁴ C. CONTI ROSSINI, *Notice sur les manuscrits éthiopiens de la Collection d’Abbadie*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale 1914 (Extrait du *Journal Asiatique* 1912–1914), pp. 185–6.

⁵ W. WRIGHT, *Catalogue of the Ethiopic Manuscripts in the British Museum acquired since the year 1847*, London, Printed by the Order of the Trustees 1877, p. 189.

⁶ [A. DILLMANN], *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum orientalium qui in Museo Britannico asservantur*, Londini, Impensis Curatorum Musei Britannici 1847, p. 51.

⁷ Handwritten catalogue (by CERULLI himself) in the Vatican Library.

⁸ GETACHEW HAILE - W. F. MACOMBER, *A catalogue of the Ethiopian manuscripts microfilmed for the Ethiopian Manuscript Microfilm Library, Addis Ababa, and the Hill Monastic Manuscript Microfilm Library, Collegeville*, vol. VI, Collegeville 1982, p. 157.

⁹ Ibid. p. 364.

¹⁰ Ibid. pp. 152–4.

¹¹ Id., vol. VII, Collegeville 1983, p. 28.

¹² S. STRELCYN, *Catalogue des manuscrits éthiopiens (Collection Griaule)*, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale 1954, pp. 247–249.

¹³ S. STRELCYN, *Catalogue des manuscrits éthiopiens de l’Accademia nazionale dei Lincei*, Roma, Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei 1976, pp. 261–264.

¹⁴ E. HAMMERSCHMIDT - V. SIX, *Äthiopische Handschriften 1: Die Handschriften der Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz (VOHD XX, 4)*, Wiesbaden, F. Steiner Verlag 1983, pp. 50–51.

¹⁵ E. HAMMERSCHMIDT - O. JÄGER, *Illuminierte äthiopische Handschriften*, Wiesbaden, F. Steiner Verlag 1968, ms. 3 p. 50.

¹⁶ S. GRÉBAUT - E. TISSERANT, *Bybliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae codices manuscripti recenti iussu Pii XII Pontifici Maximi ... Codices Aethiopici Vaticani et Borgiani ...*, Romae, In Bybliotheca Vaticana 1935, pp. 552–560.

¹⁷ Ibid., pp. 707–712.

The stemma of these manuscripts, as far as the “Life” (not the “Miracles”) is concerned, has already been established, for its main part, in that article. Three different versions, A (mss. B²B¹B²LV¹W), B (mss. A¹E¹E²) and C (mss. CV²), were identified. The proposed stemma was the following (see the aforementioned article for the discussion): Version A: 1) A²W; 2) B²L; Version B: A¹E²; Version C: CV². There was no conjunctive error connecting the other mss., but some problems remained unsolved, namely: in version A, the classification of three new manuscripts, E³, E⁴ and M; in version B, the possible common archetype with A, the existence of a sub-archetype B, the existence of a group A¹E², and the classification of the new manuscript G. We will try to give an answer to these still open questions, making use of approximately the first quarter of the entire text of the “Life” (of course, always to the exclusion of the “Miracles”, which will be discussed below).

As for the problem of the classification of mss. E³ and E⁴, it is perfectly clear that they are to be grouped with B²L. This is demonstrated by the same examples as are quoted in the 1986 article:

1. ኮኑ ፡ አቡሁ ፡ ወእሙ ፡ እምሰብአ ፡ ኄራን ፡ ...] B² and L አኮኑ ፡, now also E³E⁴;
2. ወእለሂ ፡ አጋንንት ፡ እኅዛን ፡ የሐይወ. ፡ ... እምደዌሆሙ ፡ om. B²L, now also E³E⁴;
3. ¹⁹ የጎድግኑ ፡ አንበሳ ፡ ሶበ ፡ ይሬኢ ፡ ሐርጌ ፡] B²L ተኩላ ፡ ወሐርጌ ፡, now also E³E⁴. There is also a number of other conjunctive errors, and of characteristic readings, that makes this unity of B²E³E⁴L absolutely sure and beyond any possible doubt.

It is also clear that M is to be classified with B¹. Some conjunctive errors are the following:

1. መኑ ፡ ይትመሰሎ ፡ እምቅዱሳን ፡ ቀደምት ፡ ወእምደጎርት ፡] B¹M have the incomprehensible ወእምደጎርገ in place of እምደጎርት
2. ወሢባት ፡ ውስተ ፡ አፋሁ ፡] ከመ ፡ ሲለን ፡ በውስተ ፡ አፋ ፡ M ወይመስል ፡ ከመ ፡ ሲለት ፡ ውስተ ፡ አትፋሁ ፡ B¹;
3. ወእለሰ ፡ እንበሳ ፡ እለ ፡ ማይ ፡ ፍጥረቶሙ ፡ ወኢይክሉ ፡ ይሰርሩ ፡ ላዕለ ፡] B¹ has ፬እንበሳ ፡ and M ፬እንበሳሁ ፡, in place of the correct እንበሳ ፡.

¹⁸ N. RHODOKANAKIS, *Die äthiopischen Handschriften der k. k. Hofbibliothek zu Wien*, “Sitzb. d. phil.-hist. Kl. der kais. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Wien”, 151, IV (1906), pp. 73–74.

¹⁹ Notice that the third example in the article (ወኢይጸግቡ ፡) has to be eliminated because of a reading mistake: this group of mss. has in fact ይጸግቡ ፡, and only L exhibits the negative form with a ኢ.

For version B, whereas the existence of a common archetype A+B was clear (p. 140), the problem of a common archetype (or, in fact, of a common sub-archetype) for the version B (i. e. the mss. A¹E¹E²) was still to be clarified. Now it can be said with certainty that a (sub-)archetype of this kind does exist, and this is demonstrated by examples like the following:

1. ወሶበ ፡ ጎለይኩ ፡ እንግር ፡ ጉልቆን ፡ ለነገረ ፡ ዚአሁ ፡ ወስእንኩ ፡ ፈጽሞ ፡]
instead of ጎለይኩ ፡, A¹ has አእምርኩ ፡ ጎለይኩ ፡, and E¹E² have ጎለይኩ ፡
አእምር ፡, in both cases a clear mistake;
2. ንግባእኬ ፡ ጎበ ፡ ቀዳሚ ፡ ነገር ፡ ዘይቤ ፡ ነብያት ፡ ወሐዋርያት ፡ ይብሉክ ፡
ዘመድነ ፡] instead of the right ይብሉክ ፡ (the writer is addressing the saint him-
self), A¹ and E¹ have ይብሉኒ ፡ (after ዘመድነ ፡A¹), E² omits, clearly embar-
rassed by a personal pronoun of the 1st person which does not make sense;
3. ባርከዎ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ኩልከሙ ፡ መላእክቲሁ ፡ ... እለ ፡ ትገብሩ ፡
ቃሎ ፡ ወእለ ፡ ትሰምዑ ፡ ነገር ፡] ቃሎ ፡ is the correct reading of the
Psalms (103 [102]:20), and is in fact found in the mss. CV²; instead,
A¹E¹E² have ነገር ፡, attracted by the ነገር which follows (but in this case
there is a slight possibility of polygenesis).

Leaving to further research other problems still to be solved, namely, the relationship among mss. A¹, E¹ and E² inside group B, and the position of ms. G, we can turn now to our real topic, i. e. the genealogical tree of the “Miracles”. As has been said, to our greatest surprise in these “Miracles” not only is there more than one single genealogical tree, but each of them is entirely different from that established for the “Life”.

The “Miracles” in the manuscripts related to Gabra Manfas Qeddus are usually 13 in number. There are other mss. with more than 13 miracles, which are taken into account in my edition, but these do not constitute a unity in a philological sense, and therefore they do not need to be considered here. So, the mss. to be classified for the genealogical tree of the “Miracles” are the same as those of the “Life”, with one single addition, that of a codex of the XVII c. (EMML 1385 = E⁵) which contains only the “Miracles”, and which for that reason was not utilized for the edition of the “Life”.

Among these 16 manuscripts, the succession of the miracles is more or less the same till miracle no. 8. With this miracle (which, by the way, is very short, and the only one for which the text indicates the epoch, i. e. the reign of King Naʿod) things change abruptly: mss. B², E³ and M have it at the end (i. e. as the thirteenth miracle), ms. E⁵ does not have it, mss. B¹ and A¹ do not have it and end the miracles with no. 7.

I Common archetype

In the text of the “Miracles” there is no conjunctive error common to all (or the majority) of the families, and so demonstrating that *all* the miracles derive from a common archetype. There is only one for miracle I, maybe one for miracle II, four for miracle V, perhaps one for miracle VII, two for miracle X, and maybe one for miracle XI.

Miracle I

All versions have **ወይቤላ ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ ሐሩ ፡ ሰድዋ ፡**. God is speaking to a soul; what He is saying is wanting, and it is clear that afterwards some words are also wanting, like **ወይቤሎሙ ፡ ለመላእክት ፡** (or the like) “and he said to the angels”, to whom the two imperatives are directed.

Miracle II

A common archetype is doubtful because this error is in fact a homoeoteleuton, although it is common to almost all the manuscripts: **ወእንከሩ ፡ ሰብእ ፡ ሀገር ፡ ዘንተ ፡ መንክረ ፡ ዘገብረ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅድስ ፡**. All the mss. except E²W omit **ወእንከሩ ፡ ሰብእ ሀገር ፡**, so that the accusative **ዘንተ ፡ መንክረ ፡** is not justified.

Miracle V

A common archetype is demonstrated by the passage **ወሰገደ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡**, which in some mss. is in a different, and in some cases erroneous, sequence: **እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡ ሰጊዶ ፡** A²E⁵ B¹ (grammatically correct), **እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡ ሰገደ ፡** L G. As these mss. (except for A²E⁵, where the construction is regular) have otherwise nothing in common, one must admit an original mistake ***እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡ ሰገደ ፡**, corrected by A²E⁵ and B¹ by putting the perfect into the gerundive, and by the others by restoring the correct sequence; L G have left the erroneous text unchanged.

Another relevant passage is **ወተመጠወት ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ መካናዊት ፡ ዘለሐሰት ፡ ይእቲ ፡ መበለት ፡ በልሳና ፡ ወይእቲኒ ፡ መካናዊት ፡ ለሐሰት ፡**. “And that sterile woman received what that nun had licked with her tongue, and also that sterile woman licked” (the book of the *gadl* of Gabra Manfas Qeddus has been licked by one pregnant nun; afterwards, it is licked by another woman, this time sterile, who by this fact becomes pregnant in the place of the nun): instead of the regular **ዘለሐሰት ፡**, the majority of the mss. have **ወለሐሰት ፡** or **ዘለሐሰት ፡ ወለሐሰት ፡** V¹, or **ወለሐሰት ፡ ዱኅረ ፡** A¹, or **ለሐሰት ፡** E¹V² E⁵, eliminating the

relative pronoun. The original was surely not clear (if not it would have been impossible to blur so clear a sentence), possibly with a double form, as in V¹.

A third example is the following. The abbot wants to verify if the nun is pregnant, but she is able to show her menstrual blood, thus demonstrating that she is not pregnant. In the expression **ወርእየ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ መምህር ፡ ሥርገ ፡ ማሕፀና ፡ ወደመ ፡ ተክቶሃ** “and the abbot saw the rivulet (sc. of blood) of her womb, and the blood of her menstruation”, no ms. except E⁵ has the correct **ሥርገ ፡** “rivulet”, but nearly all have gerundive forms derived from *srg^w “to ornate”, *srh “to labour”, *śrr “to found”/“to be high”; clearly there must have been an error in the archetype (maybe the *lectio faciliior* **ስርገ፡** “adorned”).

As for the fourth example, at the end of the miracle it is said that the sterile woman begat a male son, “and she became righteous” (**ወኮነት ፡ ጸድቅተ ፡**). But as it has never been said in the text that she was a sinful woman, this is clearly out of place, and appears to be merely a repetition of a passage which immediately precedes, where the same thing is (rightly) said of the sinner nun.

Miracle VII

A common archetype is perhaps demonstrated by a passage where all the mss. have **ወበጽሐ ፡** twice (**ወበጽሐ ፡ ወልዳ ፡ ለገባራት ፡ ተዝካሩ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ ተንሢኦ ፡ እምነ ፡ ምወታን ፡ ወበጽሐ ፡ እንዘ ፡ የዐርብ ፡ ፀሐይ ፡ ...**); one of them is probably superfluous.

Miracle X

A common archetype is possibly demonstrated by a passage where 8 mss. (E⁴ V² E² A² B² E³ E⁵ G) have the present **ወይብል ፡** instead of the correct **ወይቤሎ ፡/ወይቤ ፡**, and by another in which 6 mss. (CE²W B² E⁵ V²) do not have **ወይቤሎ ፡** (in a dialogue).

Miracle XI

A common archetype is demonstrated by a passage where some mss. (V² A² E³ G V¹) have **ወይብል ፡** instead of **ወይቤ ፡**, and by another, where many mss. (CE²W A² B² E¹ E⁵ G V¹) have **እስከ ፡ ዛቲ ፡ ዕለት ፡** (“up to this day”) instead of **እስከ ፡ ዛቲ ፡ ዓመት ፡** (“up to this year”, “all this year long”): a lion and a leopard have to guard a cow for the entire year, up to the festival of Gabra Manfas Qeddus; some lines below, all the mss. speak of “a year”.

II Grouping of the mss. in miracles I – VIII

2.1. The group A¹V¹W

There is no doubt that A¹V¹W form a unity. Although in some miracles there is no conjunctive error uniting them, they are united by a number of characteristic readings.

Miracle I

No conjunctive error, but at least 12 characteristic readings (11 major and 1 minor), e. g. **ወይቤ ፡ በጎሊናሁ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ መነኮስ ፡]** **ወእምዝ ፡ ጎለየ ፡ በጎሊናሁ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡ A¹ ወእምዝ ፡ ጎለየ ፡ በልቡ ፡ ወበጎሊናሁ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ መነኮስ ፡ (ብእሲ ፡ V¹) እንዘ ፡ (om. W) ይብል ፡ እምይእዜሰ ፡ V¹W.**

Miracle II

No conjunctive error, but at least 10 characteristic readings (6 major and 4 minor), e. g. **ሀበኒ ፡ መድኅኒተ ፡ ለነፍስየ ፡]** **ሀበኒ ፡ መድኅኒተ ፡ በእንተ ፡ ክርስቶስ ፡ A¹V¹W.**

Miracle III

No conjunctive error, but at least 6 characteristic readings (2 major and 4 minor), e. g. **፪፻፳፯ ዓ.ም. ፡ ፍኖት ፡]** **፪፻፳፯ ፡ A¹ ፪ ፻፳፯ ፡ በፍኖት ፡ V¹W.**

Miracle IV

No conjunctive error, but at least 9 characteristic readings (5 major and 4 minor), e. g. **ወይመስል ፡ ድምፁ ፡ ከመ ፡ እጉለ ፡ ጠሊ ፡ (ወእሐተ ፡ ዕለተ ፡ ይመስል ፡ ከመ ፡ እጉለ ፡ ከልብ ፡)]** **ወይመስል ፡ ድምፁ ፡ ፻፬ለተ ፡ ይነቁ ፡ ከመ ፡ እጉለ ፡ ጠሊ ፡ A¹V¹W** (with repetition of **፻፬ለተ**, also in the first sentence).

Miracle V

One conjunctive error: **(ወትቤላ ፡ አይቱ ፡ ነበርኪ ፡ ውነበ ፡ አይቱ ፡ ትሐውሪ ፡ ወትቤላ ፡) ኀበ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡]** **በጸሐኩ ፡ (በጸዕኩ ፡ W) ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ወለአክሲ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ V¹ ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ወለአክሲ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ W ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ወለአክሲ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ወለአቡነ ፡ A¹** (there is **ለአክሲ** ፡ some lines below, written again by A¹V¹W);

plus at least 7 characteristic readings (2 major and 5 minor).

Miracle VI (very short)

No conjunctive error, but at least 4 characteristic readings (1 major and 3 minor). The major reading is **ሕላት ፡]** **ጎዛ ፡ A¹ ጉዛ ፡ V¹ ጎዛ ፡ W.**

Miracle VII

One conjunctive error: (በጸዕነ ፡ ነፍሱን ፡ ወሥጋን ፡) ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ ወገደፍን ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ንዋየን ፡] ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ወገደፍን ፡ ንዋየን ፡ ወኩሎ ፡ ዘሎቱ ፡ ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ V¹ ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ W ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ A¹ (probably the common ancestor of A¹V¹W had two ወገደፍን ፡ as in V¹, and both A¹ and W eliminated the sentence between the two by homoeoteleuton);

plus at least 19 characteristic readings (9 major and 10 minor).

Miracle VIII (very short)

No conjunctive error nor characteristic reading.

2.1.1. The sub-group V¹W

There is no doubt also that, inside the group A¹V¹W, V¹ and W form a sub-group. This is demonstrated by a sufficient number of errors and characteristic readings.

Miracle I

No conjunctive error, but at least 12 characteristic readings (10 major and 2 minor), e. g. ወወሰድዋ ፡ ለነፍሱ ፡ ወአብጽሕዋ ፡] ወወሰድዋ ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይነከንከዋ ፡ V¹W (ያነከንከዋ ፡ V¹).

Miracle II

No conjunctive error, but at least 12 characteristic readings (7 major and 5 minor), e. g. ወብእሲትሂ ፡ ... ትቤ ፡] ወእምዝ ፡ መጽአት ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ ... ወትብል ፡ (sic; ትብል ፡ V¹) V¹W.

Miracle III

One conjunctive error: (a woman makes a journey) ጸዊራ ፡ እክለ ፡] om. እክለ ፡ V¹W (afterwards, the woman meets two brigands, who take her እክለ ፡; so, here the presence of this word is necessary).

Miracle IV

One conjunctive error (a snake has penetrated into the vulva of a woman): ወረሰዖ ፡ ቤተ ፡ በህዩ ፡] ወረሰዩ ፡ ቤታ ፡ ወነበረ ፡ በህዩ ፡ V¹W (ረሰዩ ፡ is masculine, and ቤታ ፡ feminine; in both cases the subject is ከይሲ ፡, and in the text the f. suffix in the verb ረሰዖ ፡ was justified by the fact of referring to the woman in whose womb the serpent makes its dwelling);

plus at least 13 characteristic readings (8 major and 5 minor).

Miracle V

One conjunctive error: **ወወሐኦን ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ ጸራ ፡]** **ወወጽኡ ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ ጸራ ፡** V¹W;

plus at least 25 characteristic readings (2 major and 23 minor).

Miracle VI (very short)

No conjunctive error, but at least 2 characteristic readings (1 major and 1 minor). The major reading is: **በጸሎቱ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ"ኢትሰድ ፡ ማዕተብየ ፡]** post **ገ"መ"ቅ"** add. **ተማሕፀንኩ ፡** V¹W.

Miracle VII

No conjunctive error, but at least 23 characteristic readings (8 major and 15 minor), e. g. **(ወነበረት ፡ አሐቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡) እምርሐቅ ፡ ብሔር ፡]** **ወሱተ ፡ አሐቲ ፡ ሀገር ፡** V¹W.

Miracle VIII (very short)

No conjunctive error or characteristic reading.

2.3. The group B¹B²CE⁴LM

Much more complicated, but very interesting, is the situation of the mss. (listed here in alphabetical order) B¹B²CE⁴LM. Here the relationship is different in miracle I as compared with that of the miracles II-VIII.

2.3.1. The sub-groups B²CE⁴L and B¹M in miracle I.

In miracle I the relationship is clear between B²CE⁴L, which form a family of their own, and B¹M, which form another family, which as such corresponds to the same family already established for the “Life” (see above).

That B²CE⁴L come from a common archetype is demonstrated by at least the following two conjunctive errors:

1. (Gabra Manfas Qeddus is speaking to God) **ይትሔሰው ፡ ቃልክ ፡ ቅወም ፡ ወርቱፅ ፡ ሰማይ ፡ ወምድር ፡ ሀለዉ ፡ ቅወማን ፡ (በኪዳነ ፡ ቃልክ ፡)]** **ይትሔሰው ፡ ቃልክ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ ርቱፅ ፡** B²E⁴L **ይትሔሰው ፡ ቃልክ ፡ እግዚአ ፡ ዘወጽኦ ፡ እምአፉክ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ ሀለዉ ፡ ሰማያት ፡ ወምድር ፡ ርቱፅ ፡ ቅወማን ፡** C (all these mss. have **ቅድመ ፡** in common);
2. (Gabra Manfas Qeddus is speaking about a believer) **ዘተአምነ ፡ በጸሎትየ ፡ ወይቤለኒ ፡ እገብር ፡ ተዝካረክ ፡]** **ዘተአምነ ፡ በጸሎትየ ፡ ወይቤለኒ ፡ ተዝካር ፡** B²CE⁴L (as the saint is speaking of a **ተዝካር ፡** celebrated by the believer, there is no reason to use the suffix of the 3rd person instead of that of the 1st).

Besides, there are 12 characteristic readings (7 major and 5 minor).

That B¹M, on the other hand, form another family is demonstrated by the following two (or three) conjunctive errors:

- 1.(Gabra Manfas Qeddus is speaking to the Lord about a believer) **ወሞቱሂ ፡ ኮነ ፡ በዕለተ ፡ ሞትዮ ፡] ወሞቱሂ ፡ በዕለተ ፡ ሞትዮ ፡ ዘኮነ ፡ ሞቱ ፡**
B¹ **ወሞቱሂ ፡ በዕለተ ፡ ሞትዮ ፡ ዘሞተ ፡** M. The text in B¹M is clearly deformed in the same way.
- 2.(the soul of a sinner is speaking to the Lord) **ወበጽሐት ፡ ነፍስዮ ፡ ንቤከ ፡**
] ወበጽሐት ፡ ነፍስዮ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ B¹M. There is no sense, from the part of this sinner addressing the Lord, in saying “I arrived before the Lord” instead of “before You”. That here, in B¹M, the word **እግዚአብሔር ፡** occurred twice is demonstrated not only by the manuscript M, which has it explicitly (the second time this is regular, because the text goes on as follows: **ወይቤላ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡**), but also by the ms. B¹, which has it only once (**ወበጽሐት ፡ ነፍስዮ ፡ ቅድመ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡**). Clearly there is here an homoeoteleuton in B¹, caused by the two **እግዚአብሔር ፡**.
- 3.(The Lord is speaking to the soul of the sinner, and is referring to her love for Gabra Manfas Qeddus) This is admittedly fairly doubtful as a conjunctive error: **ወይቤላ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ ወሶበ ፡ ነደ ፡ ንሊናኪ ፡ በአፍቅሮቱ ፡ ዘተአመንኪ ፡ በጸሎቱ ፡] ወይቤላ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ ወሶበ ፡ ነደድኩ ፡ በአፍቅሮቱ ፡** etc. B¹ **ወይቤላ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍስ ፡ ሶበ ፡ አፍቅርኪ ፡** etc. M. B¹M are the only two mss. not to have **ንሊናኪ ፡**. A possible explanation of what happened subsequently is that they have remedied B¹ by putting **ነደ ፡** in the 1st person, by making “God” the subject of being on fire with love for the Saint, instead of **ንሊናኪ ፡**; M is better, it eliminates “to be on fire” and simply says “you fell in love” (**አፍቅርኪ ፡**) with the Saint; this way the subject remains the same, and does not shift to “God”.

Besides, there are 4 characteristic readings (3 major and 1 minor).

2.3.2. The sub-group CE⁴M in miracles II-VIII.

The relationship changes from miracle II onwards. In fact, in miracles II-VIII the relationship is, first of all, CE⁴M.

Miracle II

At least two cases at the boundary between a real conjunctive error and a strong characteristic reading:

1. ሰሐቦቶ፡ (subject: a woman; object: a dead demon) ወገደፈቶ፡ ውስተ፡ ጸድፍ፡] አብጽሐቶ፡ ወገደፈቶ፡ ውስተ፡ ጸድፍ፡ CE⁴M.
2. (the father of a woman who will receive a grace from GMQ is speaking) ፅምደ፡ ብዕራይ፡ እገድፍ፡ ወእገብር፡ ተዝካሮ፡] ፅምደ፡ ብእራይ፡ እሁብ፡ ተዝካሮ፡ [sic] ሎቱ፡ ተዝካሮ፡ እገብር፡.

Besides, there are 9 characteristic readings (8 major and 1 minor).

Miracle III

No conjunctive error, but one good characteristic reading: (the text speaks of a woman who is going to celebrate the commemoration of the saint) ጸዊራ፡ እክለ፡ ፈሊሳ፡] ጸዊራ፡ እክለ፡ ዙተአትሲ፡ E⁴ ጸዊራ፡ እክለ፡ ዘአእተወት፡ M ጸዊራ፡ እክለ፡ ዘአስተጋብአት፡ በፍልሰት፡ C

plus 2 minor characteristic readings.

Miracle IV

One very significant conjunctive error ወይሰቲ፡] ወይውኅጥ፡ C በየውጣ፡ E⁴ በውስጡ፡ M;

with 9 characteristic readings (4 major and 5 minor).

Among the major cases one can quote the following: ወተምዕዐ፡ እግዚአብሔር፡] ወርእዮ፡ እ" CE⁴ ወርእዮ፡ እ" M (although the reading is very different, it cannot be considered an error).

Miracle V

One conjunctive error: ወለአከ፡ ሊቀ፡ አበው፡ ለውእቱ፡ መካን፡ ኀበ፡ መምህር፡ ወመምህሩሂ፡ ዐብይ፡ መዐትም፡ ወሶበ፡ ሰምዐ፡ ለአከ፡ ውእቱ፡ መምህር፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል፡ እመጽእ፡ በሃልስትአ፡ ተጋብአም፡ ጽንሐኒ፡] ወአእመረ፡ ሊቀ፡ አበው፡ ለአከ፡ ኀበ፡ መምህር፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል፡ ነፃ፡ እስመ፡ ሀለወት፡ ዘፀንሰት፡ መበለት፡ ወመምህርስ፡ መዐትም፡ ውእቱ፡ ወሶበ፡ ሰምዐ፡ ዘንተ፡ ነገረ፡ ለአከ፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል፡ በሃልስት፡ ዕለት፡ ጽንሐኒ፡ ከፍልክሙ፡ C ወአእመራ፡ ሊቀ፡ አበው፡ ከመ፡ ፀንሰት፡ ይእቲ፡ መበለት፡ ወለአከ፡ መምህራ፡ ዘንተ፡ ነገረ፡ ወመምህሩስ፡ ዐብይ፡ ወመዐትም፡ ወሶበ፡ ሰምዐ፡ ዘንተ፡ ነገረ፡ መምህራ፡ ወለአከ፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል፡ በሃልስት፡ ዕለት፡ እመጽእ፡ ተጋብአም፡ ጽንሐኒ፡ M ወአእመራ፡ ሊቀ፡ አበው፡ ከመ፡ ፀንሰት፡ ወለአከ፡ ኀበሃ፡ ወመምህርስ፡ መዐትም፡ ገረ፡ [sic, or ነረ፡] ወመምህራስ፡ መዐትም፡ ውእቱ፡ ወሶበ፡ ሰምዐ፡ ዘንተ፡ ነገረ፡ መምህራ፡ ወለአከ፡ እንዘ፡ ይብል፡ በሃልስት፡ ዕለት፡ እመጽእ፡ ጽንሐኒ፡ E⁴.

Another common error has been corrected subsequently: **ወአንበራሁ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡] ወአንከራሁ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ወአንበራሁ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡ M ወአንከራሁ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ወአእኩታሁ ፡ ወውሐቲሁ ፡ (sic) E⁴ ወአንከራሁ ፡ ግብሮ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ወስብሐቲሁ ፡ ወአእኩታሁ ፡ C** (CE⁴ differ from M; for CE⁴ together see below).

One can add at least 7 characteristic readings (2 major and 5 minor). One of the major ones is the following: (a nun is telling another woman that she is going to the church to ask for the protection of Gabra Manfas Qeddus) **ወሀሎ ፡ መጽሐፈ ፡ ገድሉ ፡ (ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡)] ከመ ፡ እልሐስ ፡ መጽሐፈ ፡ ገድሉ ፡ CE⁴M** (in the continuation of the story, by licking the book of the *gadd* of Gabra Manfas Qeddus the pregnancy of the nun will pass from her to another woman).

Miracle VI (very short)

No conjunctive error, but the following two major characteristic readings:

1. **ወመጽአ ፡ ጅብእሲ ፡] ወሀሎ ፡ ጅወሬዛ ፡ CE⁴ ወነበረ ፡ ጅወሬዛ ፡ M**
2. **ወነገረ ፡ ለኩሉ ፡ ሰብእ ፡] ተአምራሁ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" add. M ተአምራሁ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ብፁዓዊ ፡ ትሩፈ ፡ ምግባር ፡ ዘውጎሙ ፡ ለመላእክት ፡ add. CE⁴;**
plus one minor.

Miracle VII

One conjunctive error: (**ወወሰዱነ ፡ መንገለ ፡ ሰማይ ፡) እለ ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ ከመ ፡ ነበልባለ ፡ እሳት ፡ መላእክት ፡ ወተራኩብነ ፡ በፍኖት ፡ ጅብእሲ ፡ ዐብይ ፡] ወመጽአ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ዐብይ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ያንበለብል ፡ ከመ ፡ እሳት ፡ CE⁴ ወመጽአ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ያንበለብል ፡ ከመ ፡ እሳት ፡ ወተራኩብት ፡ በፍኖት ፡ ዐብይ ፡ M;**
plus 3 characteristic readings (1 major and 2 minor).

In miracle VIII, very short, there are no data available.

2.3.2.1 The mss. CE⁴ inside sub-group CE⁴M.

Within the group CE⁴M, there is no doubt that CE⁴ constitute a sub-group, i. e. that they derive from a common sub-archetype.

Miracle II

One conjunctive error: **ወጋኔን ፡ ዘይነበር ፡ ማእከሎሙ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ወብእሲት ፡] ወውእቱስ ፡ ጋኔን ፡ ዘይነበር ፡ ዲቤሃ ፡ ከመ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ CE⁴.**

Almost errors, rather than simple major characteristic readings, are the following three passages:

1. **ወብእሲትሂ ፡ ዘጎደጋ ፡ ጋኔን ፡ ትቤ ፡ ፫ጊዜ ፡ ተንሥእ ፡ ጋኔን ፡ በጸሎቱ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" አኀዘት ፡ ሐብለ ፡ ባሕቲታ ፡] ወተንሥአት ፡ ይእቲ ፡**

- ብእሲት ፡ ወአኅዘት ፡ ሐብለ ፡ ባሕቲታ ፡** CE⁴. Here the shortening of the text is very heavy, and not justified by an homoeoteleuton.
2. (Gabra Manfas Qeddus has come in the night to kill the demon who is possessing a woman) **ወወጽአ ፡** (subject: the husband of the woman) **በዴዴ ፡ ቤታ ፡ ወተቀበሎ ፡** (object: GMQ) **ወጸረ ፡** (subject: probably GMQ)] **ወወጽአ ፡ (ሶበ ፡ ወጽአ ፡ C) እምዴዴ ፡ ቤታ ፡ ወአውደቀ ፡ ("ቆ ፡ C) ውስተ ፡ አንቀጽ ፡** CE⁴. This reading is very awkward, and, as has been said, nearly a mistake; it refers to the saint, but he has already defeated the demon on the door in a preceding passage; the correct text, instead, simply says that, after this, Gabra Manfas Qeddus “left”).
3. **ወውእቶሙሰ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ወብእሲት ፡ ደንገፁ ፡] ወሰምዑ ፡ አቡሃ ፡ ወእማ ፡** CE⁴. Another very strange reading, this time without any parallel in other passages.

Besides, there are 13 characteristic readings (4 major and 9 minor).

Miracle III

Two conjunctive errors:

1. **ሐቅለ ፡ ገዳም ፡] ሐቅል ፡ ገዳም ፡** CE⁴;
2. **ቀዳሚ ፡ ጎደርኩ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ወድጎረሰ ፡ ገደፍኩ ፡ ነፍሰዩ ፡ ... ለፍቁሩ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ፡] ጎደርኩ ፡ — ወድጎረሰ ፡** om. CE⁴ (no justifying *piège à copiste*).

Miracle IV

Three conjunctive errors:

1. (the text speaks of a woman into whom a snake has penetrated) **(ወኮነት ፡ ከመ ፡ ብርዕ ፡) ማእከለ ፡ ከርሃ ፡ (እስከ ፡ ክሳዳ ፡)] ወተፈሃሐ ፡ ውእቲ ፡** CE⁴;
2. **ወመልአ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ ከይሲ ፡ ወተለዐለ ፡ ዐብዩ ፡]** om. CE⁴ (no homoeoteleuton: this sentence follows immediately that of the preceding number, and in turn it is followed by **ወሶበ ፡ ተናገረት ፡ ምስለ ፡ ምታ ፡ ይቀንእ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ ከይሲ ፡)**;
3. **ወሀበኒ ፡ እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለከይሲ ፡]** **ወሀበኒ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ከይሲ ፡ በውስጥ ፡ (በውሳጤ ፡ C) እስኪትዩ ፡ ("ቶዩ ፡ E⁴).** The same woman is speaking here, and **እስኪትዩ ፡** is generally a designation for the male genitals. Its usage here can be explained by its appearance (referring to the male genitals) very shortly after.

There are also at least 24 characteristic readings (11 major and 13 minor).

Miracle V

Four conjunctive errors:

1. ወወሀበቶ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ዕጣነ ፡ ወትቤሎ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ ለእመ ፡ ናዘዝኪ ፡ ዘገበርኩ ፡ ገጠአትዩ ፡ ገባእ ፡ ሊተ ፡] ወወሀበቶ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ዕጣነ ፡ ለእመ ፡ ናዘዝኪ ፡ etc.;
2. (ወሀሎ ፡ መጽሐፈ ፡ ገድሉ ፡ ገብ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ከሃሊ ፡ ውእቱ ፡) ሰአልክሲ ፡ ከመ ፡ ይናዘዝኪ ፡ ወአነኒ ፡ እኩኖ ፡ አመተ ፡ (ወትቤላ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት) om. CE⁴ (not explainable through homoeoteleuton);
3. (ሀለወት ፡ ካልእ ፡) መካን ፡ (ወክልኤሆን ፡ መሐላ ፡)] ገብ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ሚጥ ፡ ላቲ ፡ ከመ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ሕፃን ፡ add. E⁴ ገብ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ሚጥ ፡ ላቲ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ሕፃን ፡ ሀሎ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ከርሣ ፡ add. C;
4. (ወበሳኒታ ፡ መጽአ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ መዐትም ፡ መምህር ፡) ወነበረ ፡ ገብ ፡ አንቀጸ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ወአምጽአ ፡ ካህናተ ፡ ወመነኮሳተ ፡ (ወለአከ ፡ ገብ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ መበለት ፡)] om. CE⁴ (not justified by homoeoteleuton).

To these errors, one can add at least 26 characteristic readings (14 major and 12 minor).

Miracle VI (very short)

One conjunctive error: ወመሰሎ ፡ ሥጋ ፡ ወይቤሎ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡] ወአምሐሎ ፡ (ወእመ ፡ ሀሎ ፡ E⁴) ውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ወውእቱ ፡ ሆኖ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይብል ፡ CE⁴;

together with one major characteristic reading: እንዘ ፡ ይከይድ ፡ በፍኖት ፡ አመ ፡ ፩ለመጋብት ፡ ገብ ፡ ተዝካሩ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" (ወነሥአ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡ ሆኖ ፡)] አመ ፡ — ገ"መ"ቅ" om. CE⁴ (no homoeoteleuton; nearly an error, because without this precision the sentence makes less sense); plus one minor characteristic reading.

Miracle VII

Three conjunctive errors:

1. (በምንት ፡ ግብር ፡ ተንሣእከ ፡) ወበምንት ፡ ክህልከ ፡ ትትነሣእ ፡ እምነ ፡ ምዒታን ፡ ዘወድቀ ፡ በላዕሌክሙ ፡ ዐብይ ፡ ጸድፍ ፡] ወበምንት ፡ — በላዕሌክሙ ፡ om. CE⁴ (a kind of homoeoteleuton?);
2. (ወሰዱነ ፡ መንገለ ፡ ሰማይ ፡ ለኩልነ ፡) እለ ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ ከመ ፡ ነበልባለ ፡ እሳት ፡ መላእክት ፡ ወተራኩብነ ፡ በፍኖት ፡ ፩ብእሲ ፡ ዐብይ ፡] ወመጽአ ፡ ዐብይ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ያንበለብል ፡ ከመ ፡ እሳት ፡ CE⁴;
3. ወውእቶሙስ ፡ ሰብአ ፡ ሀገር ፡] ወውእቱስ ፡ ሰብአ ፡ ሀገር ፡ CE⁴.

Besides, at least 13 characteristic readings (7 major and 6 minor).

Miracle VIII (extremely short)

One conjunctive error: (ጥተ ፡) ሕፃን ፡] ሕፃኑ ፡ CE⁴;

and one major characteristic reading: (ወሐለበት ፡ ሐሊበ ፡ እምአጥባቲሃ ፡) ወጠበወ ፡] ዘከመዝ ፡ ረሰየ ፡ add. E⁴ ዘከመዝ ፡ ረሰየ ፡ አቡነ ፡ add. C.

2.3.2.2. The position of ms. M inside sub-group CE⁴M.

But problems arise when we see that M continues to have traits in common with B¹ also in the miracles after number I, i. e. when it is clearly tied with CE⁴. The material, generally speaking, is rather scanty, but nevertheless significant.

Miracle II

No element.

Miracle III

There is a minor characteristic reading: (ወነገረት ፡) ለሰብአ ፡ ሀገር ፡] ለሰብአ ፡ B¹M, and one error, due to a very widespread grammatical phenomenon (the lack of the accusative), and so not very significant: ወይእተ ፡ ጊዜ ፡] ወይእተ ፡ ጊዜ ፡ B¹M.

But what is very important in this miracle is the passage where a lion assails a brigand and seizes his head. The text has ወአኅዞ ፡ ርእሶ ፡, whereas B¹M add ጌን ፡ as the subject. As there is nowhere mention of a ጌን ፡ in the text and the subject is clearly the lion, the addition of this word in B¹M is all the more astonishing.

Miracle IV

The material is fairly poor. In fact, only a minor characteristic reading: (ይበልዕ ፡) አማዑተ ፡ ከርሣ ፡] አማዑተ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ከርሣ ፡ B¹M አማዑተሃ ፡ CE⁴ (with A²).

Miracle V

There is one error (or at least one characteristic reading): (ወእምድኅረዝ ፡ ጸረ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ ወነገራ ፡) ዘከመ ፡ ነገራ ፡ (ለመበለት ፡ ወስምዑት ፡ ይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ በሕልማ ፡) om. B¹M (text incomprehensible in the general economy of the novel, because the subject of the verb had already spoken to the nun, but it is a homoeoteleuton);

with two minor characteristic readings:

1. (መጽአ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ መዐትም ፡) መምህር ፡] መምህራ ፡ B¹M;
2. ወነበረ ፡ ኀበ ፡ አንቀጸ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡] om. አንቀጸ ፡ B¹M.

Miracle VI

There are two remarkable errors, but the first is shared also by mss. A¹W: (ወነሥአ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡ ያፍ ፡) ወመሰሎ ፡ ሥጋ ፡] ዘምስለ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡ B¹M (ዘምስለ ፡ ማእሰ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡ ወአውገዞ ፡ A¹ ዘምስለ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይመስሎ ፡ ሥጋ ፡ W), whereas the second, shared also by CE⁴, could confirm a common origin of B¹M with CE⁴ (see below): (ወይቤሎ ፡ ... በጸሎቱ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ኀብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡) ኢትስድ ፡ (ማዕተብየ ፡)] ከመ ፡ ኢትወስድ ፡ B¹ ከመ ፡ ኢትወስድ ፡ M ከመ ፡ ኢትወስድ ፡ E⁴ ከመ ፡ ኢይስድ ፡ C.

Miracle VII

No conjunctive error. The only major characteristic reading ties B¹M with CE⁴ (but also with A²; for the relationship of CE⁴ with A² see below): (ኀብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡) ዘተአመንኪ ፡] ዘተአመንኪ ፡ በጸሎቱ ፡ CE⁴M A² ዘተአመንኪ ፡ በጸሎትየ ፡ B¹.

There are also two minor characteristic readings, of no great significance:

1. ወድኅረ ፡ ጸውዐኒ ፡] ወጸውዐኒ ፡ ድኅረ ፡ B¹ CE⁴ ወጸውዐኒ ፡ /// M;
2. (ኀብረ ፡) ኀብረ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትቀነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡] ምስሌሆሙ ፡ ኀብረ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትቀነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡ B¹ ኀብረ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትቀነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡ M (cp. ምስሌሆሙ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትቀነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡ CE⁴).

Miracle VIII

No data. As has been said, this miracle is very short.

2.3.3. General conclusions on group B¹B²CE⁴LM.

The solution proposed here is that, for the miracles II to VII (nothing can be said for miracle VIII), a sub-archetype B¹CE⁴M existed. The existence of this sub-archetype is demonstrated by the reading **ጌን ፡** in miracle IV. This reading is so strange that it has been obvious, for the other mss. of the family, to eliminate it; only B¹ and M remained faithful to the original. Notice that this means that they do not constitute a family of their own, because this is only a conservation of an old reading once common to the entire group and not an innovation particular to these two mss. only.

The original unity of the group B¹CE⁴M is also demonstrated by the reading **ኢትስድ ፡ /ከመ ፡ ኢትወስድ ፡** (with variants), where the **ከመ ፡** is totally unexplained (and where C has rightly saved the situation by putting the entire sentence in indirect speech: **ከመ ፡ ኢይስድ ፡**).

Possibly also the minimal reading **ወደኅረ ፡ ጸውዐኒ ፡] ወጸውዐኒ ፡ ደኅረ ፡** of B¹CE⁴, and perhaps M, confirms this.

The other variants must be explained accordingly.

In part they are innovations of CE⁴, which, as we have seen, form a well identified sub-group; the reading in B¹M represents, accordingly, the original one of the group, in turn an innovation as compared with the original text, and superseded by the subsequent innovation by CE⁴. Of course, in these cases the reading of CE⁴ must be different from that of all the other mss., unless the possibility of polygenesis is very high. This latter is the case with the error (not very important to be sure) of **ወይእቲ ፡ ጊዜ ፡** for the correct **ወይእቲ ፡ ጊዜ ፡**, which can be interpreted as belonging to the (sub-)archetype, with an obvious correction from the part of CE⁴ (and of the rest of the mss., independently). The first case, instead, is that of **አማዑተ ፡ በውስተ ፡ ከርኅ ፡** (reading of B¹M and original of the group)/**አማዑተ፡፡** (reading of CE⁴; for the coincidence of CE⁴ with A² see below), as against the reading **አማዑተ ፡ ከርኅ ፡** of all the other mss.: B¹CE⁴M innovated, and afterwards CE⁴ changed again, in both cases differently from the generally accepted text. The same can be said of **መጽአ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ መዐትም ፡ መምህራ ፡** of B¹M (slightly different from the text, which has **መምህር ፡** as the only difference), as against **መጽአ ፡ መምህራ ፡ በመዐት ፡** of CE⁴. This is all the more true for the case of **ወነበረ ፡ ኅበ ፡ አንቀጸ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡**, where B¹M omit **አንቀጸ ፡** but CE⁴ omit an entire passage (from **ነበረ ፡** to **መነከስተ ፡**, some words after).

More or less the same holds true with the reading **ነበረ ፡ ኅቡረ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትዋነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡**. Since B¹ has **ነበረ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡ ኅቡረ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትዋነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡**, M **ነበረ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትዋነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡**, and CE⁴ **ነበረ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይትዋነይ ፡ ወይስሕቅ ፡**, it is clear that the original reading of B¹CE⁴M was the reading preserved in M (**ነበረ ፡ ኅቡረ ፡ ምስሌሆሙ ፡**), and that CE⁴ eliminated **ኅቡረ ፡** because of haplography.

More or less the same holds true also with the case of (**ወነሥአ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡ ያፍ ፡**) **ወመሰለ ፡ ሥጋ ፡**. Here the (sub-)archetype of B¹CE⁴M must have started with a mistake like **ዘምሰለ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡**. Note that the (sub-)archetype of the group A¹V¹W also must have had the same initial mistake, but this does not affect very seriously our reconstruction; as there are no other examples, here or in other miracles, of a union of these two groups, we are compelled to admit that this mistake originated independently in both of them by polygenesis. From this starting point, B¹ and M have preserved the original, meaningless reading (**ዘምሰለ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡**); the ancestor of CE⁴ was in great difficulty (as presumably B¹ and M, but without having the courage to change), and changed by uniting

the corrupt passage to the following sentence (ወይቤሎ : ውእቲ : ብእሲ :): ወአምሐሎ : (ወአመ : ሀሎ : E⁴, further mistake) ውእቲ : ብእሲ : ለውእቲ : ዖፍ : እንዘ : ይብል :. By the way, A¹ also corrected the sentence very profoundly (ወነሥአ : ማዕተብ : ዖፍ : ዘምስለ : ማእሰ : ሥጋሁ : ወአውገዙ : A¹), whereas W accepted the faulty sentence, but by adding afterwards the correct one, surely by way of contamination (... ዘምስለ : ሥጋሁ : እንዘ : ይመስሎ : ሥጋ :)

Finally, the case of (ነገረት :) ለሰብአ : ሀገር : , which has ለሰብእ : in B¹M, is of so little significance that it cannot constitute any serious problem; E⁴ omits this expression, and the ለሰብአ : ሀገር : of the only remaining ms. of this group, C, could be the same as the general reading merely because of the natural tendency towards a more complete (and extremely frequent) expression.

In another case, the mistake does not represent a common patrimony of the group B¹CE⁴M, but only a casual coincidence. This is the elimination of ዘከመ : ነገራ : , which must have happened independently in B¹ and in M, because it is scarcely probable that, if it was wanting in the (sub-)archetype, CE⁴ could have restituted it, unless they were contaminated. As it is an homoeoteleuton, the hypothesis of a polygenetic error in B¹ and M is highly plausible.

2.4. The group A²E⁵.

That another group A² plus E⁵ exists seems also fairly probable from the following data.

Miracle I

No conjunctive error, but at least 7 characteristic readings (4 major and 3 minor), e. g. ወይገብር : ብዙኅ : ሥራያተ : ወጣዖታተ :] እንዘ : ይገብር : ብዙኅ : ሥራያተ : ወያመልክ : ጥዖታተ : A²E⁵.

Miracle II

No conjunctive error or major characteristic reading, but at least 8 minor characteristic readings, e. g. ፅምደ : ብዕራይ : እገድፍ : ወእገብር : ተዝካሮ :] ፅምደ : ብዕራይ : እገድፍ : ለገብረ : ተዝካሮ : ለአቡዩ : A²E⁵.

Miracle III

One conjunctive error: ነገረት : ለሰብአ : ሀገር : ዘከመ : ገብረ : ተዝካሮ :] ነገረት : ለሰብአ : ሀገር : ዘከመ : (ከመ : A²) ይግበሩ : ተዝካሮ : A²E⁵;
plus 4 characteristic readings (1 major and 3 minor).

Miracle IV

One conjunctive error

**ወኢኖመት ፡ ትሰምዕ ፡ (ወኩሎሙ ፡ ሰብአ ፡ ቤታ ፡ ይሰምዑ ፡)] ነዊሣ ፡
ወእንዘ ፡ ትሰምዕ ፡ A²E⁵;**
plus 7 characteristic readings (4 major and 3 minor).

Miracle V

One conjunctive error: **ወለአክ ፡ ኀቤየ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ትብል ፡ ፀንሰት ፡] ወነበርክ ፡
ኀቤየ ፡ etc. A²E⁵;**
plus 14 characteristic readings (2 major and 12 minor).

Miracle VI (very short)

No conjunctive error, but at least 9 characteristic readings (3 major and 6 minor), e. g. **የፍ ፡ ሕለት ፡] የፍ ፡ ጡልሔት ፡ A² የፍ ፡ ጡልሔት ፡ E⁵** (cp. another passage in the same miracle: **ጡልሔት ፡ A² ጡላት ፡ E⁵**).

Miracle VII

No conjunctive error, but at least 5 characteristic readings (2 major and 3 minor). The major readings are the following:

1. **ወሰዱነ ፡ ... እለ ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ ከመ ፡ ነበልባለ ፡ እሳት ፡ መላእክት ፡]
እሙንቱ ፡ add. A²E⁵ (almost an error);**
2. **ወሶበ ፡ ርኢነ ፡ አልባሲሁ ፡ ወደቅነ ፡ ኩልነ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይመስል ፡
ከመ ፡ መብረቅ ፡] ወሶበ ፡ ርኢነ ፡ አልባሲሁ ፡ ወደቅነ ፡ ኩልነ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡
ወመብረቅ ፡ እሳት ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ A²E⁵.**

2.5. The relationship between A² and CE⁴.

But now problems begin, because it is precisely in miracle VII that there are readings in common between A² (not E⁵) on the one hand, and CE⁴ on the other. These readings are very strong - in fact, much stronger than those uniting A² with E⁵. The data are the following:

two conjunctive errors (in fact, lacunae not due to homoeoteleuton):

1. **(ለምንት ፡ አምጸዕክሲ ፡ ለዝ ፡ ሕፃን ፡ ወልዳ ፡ ለገባሪተ ፡ ተዝካርየ ።)
ወአነሂ ፡ እወስዶ ፡ ይግባእ ፡ ኀበ ፡ እሙ ፡ (ወይእተ ፡ ጊዜ ፡ አብጽሐኒ ፡
ኀበ ፡ ደፈነኒ ፡ ጸድፍ ፡)] om. CE⁴ + A²;**
2. **(ገብኡ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ... ወኩሎ ፡ ሰብአ ፡ ሀገር ፡) ዘምስለ ፡
አንስቲያሆሙ ፡ ወኩሎሙ ፡ ካህናት ፡ ወዲያቆናት ፡ (ወአብርሁ ፡
ማኅቶቶሙ ፡)] om. CE⁴ A⁵;**

plus 5 or 6 major characteristic readings:

1. (... ኮከበ ፡ ሰማይ ፡) ወእምኩሎሙ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ አኅዘኒ ፡] ወአኅዘኒ ፡ $CE^4 + A^2 + L$;
2. ወይቤለኒ ፡ ሐር ፡ ግባእ ፡] om. ሐር ፡ $CE^4 + A^2$;
3. (ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡) ዘተአመንኪዮ ፡] ዘተአመንኪ ፡ በጸሎቱ ፡ $CE^4M + A^2$ ዘተአመንኪ ፡ በጸሊትዮ ፡ B^1);
4. በጻዕነ ፡ ነፍስነ ፡ ወሥጋነ ፡ ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ ወገደፍነ ፡ ኩሎ ፡ ንዋዩ ነ ፡] ንሕነ ፡ (also E^5) በጻዕነ ፡ ከመ ፡ ንግበር ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ ወገደፍነ ፡ ነፍስነ ፡ ወሥጋነ ፡ ወንዋይነ ፡ ወኩሎ ፡ $CE^4 + A^2$;
5. ወድኅረ ፡] ወዘንተ ፡ ብሂሎ ፡ $CM A^2$ ወይቤሎ ፡ ብሂሎ ፡ E^4 ;
6. ወገብኡ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ቤቶሙ ፡] ወተፈሥሐ ፡ ፈድፋድ ፡ ወአንከሩ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ [rubr.] ብረ ፡ [sic] መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ E^4 ወተፈሥሐ ፡ ፈድፋድ ፡ ወአንከሩ ፡ ግብሮ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ C ወተፈሥሐ ፡ ፈድፋድ ፡ ወአንከሩ ፡ ተአምሪሁ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገብረ ፡ መንፈስ ፡ ቅዱስ ፡ A^2 ;

and at least one minor characteristic reading:

ከመዝ ፡ እንዝ ፡ ይብሉ ፡] ወዘንተ ፡ እንዝ ፡ ይብሉ ፡ $CE^4 + A^2$.

Even more delicate is the situation in miracle VIII, too short to provide a full documentation. Here, there is no trace of a connection $A^2 - E^5$, but there are indications of a connection $A^2 - CE^4$, based on the following data: two possible conjunctive errors:

1. ኀበ ፡ ይሰትዩ ፡) ቤተ ፡ ማኅበሩ ፡ (ለአቡነ ፡)] ቤተ ፡ ማኅበሮሙ ፡ $E^4 + A^2$ (ቤተ ፡ ማኅበር ፡ C). The plural is perhaps attracted by the verb; the error is possibly polygenetic;
2. ወአውረደቶ ፡ ወአንበረቶ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ምድር ፡] ወአንበረቶ ፡ om. C ወአንበረቶ ፡ ውስተ ፡ ምድር ፡ om. $E^4 A^2$ (but also with E^1V^2);

one major characteristic reading: (last word of the miracle in the other mss.) ወጠበወ ፡] ዘከመዝ ፡ ረሰዩ ፡ add. E^4 ዘከመዝ ፡ ረሰዩዩ ፡ አቡነ ፡ add. C ውእቱ ፡ ሕፃን ፡ ዘከመዝ ፡ ረሰዩ ፡ add. A^2 ;

and one minor characteristic reading: (ወወደዩቶ ፡) ውስተ ፡ ጋን ፡] በውእቱ ፡ ጋን ፡ $CE^4 + A^2$.

2.6. The relationship between A^2CE^4 and B^1CE^4M .

To conciliate the kinship between CE^4 and A^2 and that between B^1CE^4M would be very difficult, if all these mss. are put on the same level. But one fact is evident, namely, that the coincidence between CE^4 and A^2 does not superpose itself on those of CE^4 with B^1M and of A^2 with E^5 ; on the contrary, it begins where

the second stops, i. e. in the first half of miracle VII; here, the last two significant readings linking A^2 with E^5 (cp. above **ወሰዱን ፡ ... እለ ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ ከመ ፡ ነበልባለ ፡ እሳት ፡ መላእክት ፡] እመ-ንቱ ፡ A^2E^5 , and **ወሶበ ፡ ርኢን ፡ አልባሲሁ ፡ ወደቅን ፡ ኩልን ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይመስል ፡ ከመ ፡ መብረቅ ፡] ወሶበ ፡ ርኢን ፡ አልባሲሁ ፡ ወደቅን ፡ ኩልን ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ ወመብረቀ ፡ እሳት ፡ ይመስሉ ፡ A^2E^5) are followed, some lines after in the text, by the first significant reading linking CE^4 with A^2 (see above **ወእነዚ ፡ for $ወእምኩሎሙ ፡ ሕፃናት ፡ እነዚ ፡$, which is also common to L, or otherwise the omission of **ወእነሂ ፡ እወስዶ ፡ ይግባእ ፡ ኀበ ፡ እሙ ፡**, some words after). There is only one exception to this non-overlapping, that is the minor variant **አማዑተ ፡ በውሱተ ፡ ከርሃ ፡ (B^1M)/አማዑቲሃ ፡ $CE^4 + A^2$, seen above, in miracle IV, which is geographically isolated and intrinsically of no great weight. So, instead of elaborating complex genealogical structures, all this only means that the scribe of A^5 , or of a lost ancestor of this codex, has changed, for some unknown reason, the model from which he was copying, moving from a “ E^2 ” model to a “ CE^4 ” model; and he did so exactly at some point during the passage between the two different families of variants.********

2.7. The group E^1V^2 .

The position of E^1V^2 is clear only in some miracles. In fact, we do have clear evidence for their connection only for miracles I (which, as we have already seen, has a position on its own also with regard to other groups of mss.), V, VII and VIII; nothing for miracles II, III, IV, and VI. It could be that the lack of evidence for these miracles is due to chance, and that E^1V^2 are connected even in them; but this is not very probable, given the abundance of evidence for their connection in miracles I, V (much less for VII), and even in the very short miracle VIII, and given also the rather complex situation of the miracles of Gabra Manfas Qeddus and the variations already seen above for other mss.; so, it is better not to pronounce about the kinship of E^1V^2 in miracles II-IV and VI. Another problem, for the moment insoluble, is the abundance of the evidence in miracles I, V, and VIII, and its comparative scarcity in miracle VI.

For miracles I, V, VII and VIII, the data are as follows.

Miracle I

Two conjunctive errors or additions or omissions:

1. **አኮ ፡ ሰብእ ፡ ባሕቲቱ ፡ ዘያወስብ ፡ አላ ፡ አክልብተ ፡ ወለእመ ፡ ኢረከበ ፡ አክልብተ ፡ ያወስብ ፡ ምድረ ፡ ነዲቆ ፡] om. E^1V^2 (this omission is not justified by a homoeoteuton; the entire passage is **ወነበረ ፡ ጀመነከስ ፡ ኃጥእ ፡ ወይንብር ፡ ብዙኀ ፡ ሥራያተ ፡ ወጣዖታተ ፡ ወአማልክተ ፡ ወብዙኀ ፡****

ዝሙታተ ። አኮ ፡ ሰብእ ፡ ባሕቲቲ ፡ ዘያወሰብ ፡ አላ ፡ አክልብተ ፡ ወለእመ ፡ ኢረከበ ፡ አክልብተ ፡ ያወሰብ ፡ ምድረ ፡ ነዲቆ ። ወአሐተ ፡ ዕለተ ፡ ጸረ ፡ ኃበ ፡ ሀሎ ፡ መጽሐፈ ፡ ገድሎ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ... Here the text must have been censored by the scribe).

2. ለእመ ፡ ኢፈቀድክ (ምሒሮቶ ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ደምረኒ ፡ ምስሌሁ ፡)] ለእመ ፡ ፈቀድክ ፡ E¹V² (GMQ is asking God to be merciful with the sinner he is protecting; *if not*, he wants to be united with him in the same destiny);

and at least one major characteristic reading: ወይቤላ ፡ (እግዚአብሔር ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ነፍሱ ፡)] ወይቤ ፡ E¹V².

Miracle V

Not less than 11 conjunctive errors:

1. ወለአከ ፡ ሊቀ ፡ አበው ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ መካን ፡ ኀበ ፡ መምህር ፡] ወለአከ ፡ ሊቀ ፡ አበው ፡ ኀበ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ መካን ፡ ወኀበ ፡ መምህር ፡ E¹V²;
2. ወወሀበቶ ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ዕጣነ ፡] ወትቤሎ ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ዕጣን ፡ V² ለውእቲ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ዕጣን ፡ (without verb) E¹;
3. ወዘንተ ፡ ነገረ ፡ ፈሕሞን ፡ ጸራ ፡ አብያቲሆን ፡] ወዘንተ ፡ ነገረ ፡ ፈሕሞ ፡ ጸራ ፡ etc. E¹V;
4. ወበሳኒታ ፡ ነቂሆን ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ ተረከባ ፡] ወበሳኒታ ፡ ነቂሆ ፡ ተረከባ ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ E¹V²;
5. ወአንበራሁ ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡] ወአንበራሆን ፡ ለውእቲ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡ E¹V²;
6. ወወሕአን ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ ጸራ ፡] ወወሕአ ፡ ክልኤሆን ፡ ጸራ ፡ E¹V²;
7. ወመጽአት ፡ ለብሳ ፡ አፅርቅት ፡] ወመጽአ ፡ ተቋሪፋ ፡ ንስቲተ ፡ E¹ ወመጽአ ፡ ተቋሪፋ ፡ ትሰቲተ ፡ V²(?);
8. ሥርገ ፡ ማሕፀና ፡ ወደመ ፡ ትክቶሃ ፡] ስርገ ፡ ማሕፀና ፡ ወጸሪቆ ፡ ኩለንታሃ ፡ E¹ ሰሪሃ ፡ ማሕፀን ፡ ሰሪሃ ፡ ወጸሪቆ ፡ ኩለንታሃ ፡ V²;
 [(ወይቤሎ ፡ እምአይቲ ፡ ረከብከ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ነገረ ፡) ወእምአይቲ ፡ አምጸእኮ ፡ ለዝ ፡ ወእምአይ ፡ መጽአ ፡ ዝንቲ ፡ ደም ፡ መለአከ ፡ ኀቤየ ፡ እንዝ ፡ ትብል ፡ ፀንሰት ፡] om. E¹V², but this could be polygenetic because of the many በኢይቲ ፡ /እምአይቲ ፡ /እምአይ ፡ which precede)];
9. ወኮነ ፡ ሊቀ ፡ አበው ፡ ኀፋረ ፡] ወኮነ ፡ ሊቀ ፡ አበው ፡ ናዙዘ ፡ E¹V²;
 [(ወዘበጠ ፡ ውእቲ ፡ መምህር ፡ ወወሀበ ፡ ንስሓ ፡] ወመምህር ፡ ወሀበ ፡ ንስሓ ፡ /ለንስሓ ፡ here E¹V² is surely not a mistake, but a voluntary correction)];
10. ወእምድኅረዝ ፡ ኮነት ፡ ጸድቅተ ፡ ወገብረት ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡] ወእምድኅረዝ ፡ ገብረት ፡ ተዝካሮ ፡ E¹V²;

11. **ወለደት ፡ ወልደ ፡ ተባዕተ ፡] ወለደት ፡ ጅተባዕተ ፡** E¹V²;
with at least 21 characteristic readings (8 major and 13 minor).

Miracle VII

One conjunctive error: **ዘወድቀ ፡ ላዕሌክሙ ፡ ዐብይ ፡ ጸድፍ ፡]** om. **ዐብይ ፡ ጸድፍ ፡** E¹V² (no equivalent nor understood subject),
and one minor characteristic reading.

Miracle VIII

At least three conjunctive errors or additions or omissions (very many for such a short miracle):

1. **ስምዑ ፡ በመንግሥተ ፡ ናኦድ ፡ ዘገብረ ፡ ለአሐቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ አቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ፡ ተአምረ ፡ ወእምድኅረ ፡ ሞተ ፡ ወልዳ ፡ ሕዋን ፡ ወእምድኅረ ፡ ወጽአት ፡ ወወሰደቶ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ይሰትዩ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ማኅበሩ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ"]**
ስምዑ ፡ ዘገብረ ፡ (ዘንተ ፡ ዘገብረ ፡ E¹) ወሀለወት ፡ አሐቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ ተአምረ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ፡ በመዋዕለ ፡ መንግሥቱ ፡ ለናኦድ ፡ ሐመ ፡ ወልዳ ፡ ለይእቲ ፡ ብእሲት ፡ ወሞተ ፡ በጊዜሃ ፡ ወበከዩት ፡ ፈድፋድ ፡ ወነደ ፡ ልባ ፡ ከመ ፡ እሳት ፡ ወወሰደት ፡ (ወእምዛ ፡ ሀለዩት ፡ E¹ ut vid.) ወረከበቶ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ፡ ከዊኖ ፡ ሕዋን ፡ (መምህጽን ፡ E¹) ለዘተአመኖ ፡ ወወሰደቶ ፡ etc. E¹V²;
2. **ወክልሐ ፡ በውስተ ፡ ጋን ፡] ወሶበ ፡ ሰምዐቶ ፡ እነዝ ፡ ይኬልሕ ፡ በውስጡ ፡ አትሐተት ፡ አዕይንቲሃ ፡ ወርእየት ፡ እንዝ ፡ ሕያው ፡ ውእቱ ፡** add. E¹V²;
3. **ወጠበወ ፡] ወአኮተቶ ፡ ለእግዚአብሔር ፡ ዘገብረ ፡ ላቲ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ በጸሎቱ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ገዳማዊ ፡ ወአንከሩ ፡ እለ ፡ ሰምዑ ፡ ዘንተ ፡** add. E¹V²;

and at least 3 characteristic readings (2 major and 1 minor).

2.8. A possible E²W-group?

Nothing certain can be said on the relationship of the mss. E² and W for the first seven miracles. As W is already united with A¹V¹ (see above), it would be very difficult to insert E² also in this group. So, the correspondences E² - W which are found in some of these miracles, i. e.

miracle II: perhaps **ወአርአየ ፡ ግብሮ ፡** text, add. **ወኃይሎ ፡** E²W, and above all **ወዴገንዋ ፡ እንዝ ፡ ያነክሩ ፡** text, **ወዴገንዋ ፡ ወአንከርዋ ፡** E² ወተለውዋ ፡ W;

miracle III: **ጸዊራ ፡ እክለ ፡ ፈሊሳ ፡** text, **ጸዊራ ፡ እክለ ፡ ፈሊሳ ፡** E²W;

miracle IV: **እንዝ ፡ ሀለወት ፡ ኑበራ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ሰንት ፡** text, **እንዝ ፡ ሀለወት ፡ ኑበራ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ሙሓዝ ፡ ሰንት ፡** E²W;

miracle VI: **እንዝ ፡ ትብል ፡ ፀንሰት ፡** text, **እንዝ ፡ ትብል ፡ ዮም ፡ ፀንሰት ፡** E²W;

miracle VII: (ጸዊሮ ፡ ሐዲሰ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡) ... ወነሥኦ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡ ሆፍ ፡ text,
ወነሥኦ ፡ ወወሰዶ ፡ ማዕተበ ፡ ሆፍ ፡ W, ማዕተበ ፡ ወሰዶ ፡ ሆፍ ፡ E²,

are to be considered as mere coincidences and/or polygenetic errors.

Only in miracle VIII do we have good documentation of a unity E²-W,
with a conjunctive error

(እንዘ ፡ ትብል ፡) አንሥኦ ፡ ለወልድዮ ፡] ያነሥኦ ፡ ለወልድዮ ፡ E²W,
two major characteristic readings

1. (ወወሰዶ ፡) ውስተ ፡ ጋን ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ በድነ ፡ ወልዳ ፡] ለወልዳ ፡ ውስቱቱ ፡ E²W
2. ዝጋን ፡ ዘይሠራዕ ፡ ማኅበርከ ፡] ዝጋን ፡ ዘይሰፍሩ ፡ ማኅበርከ ፡ W ዝጋን ፡ ዘይፋራ ፡ (sic) ማኅበርከ ፡ E²,

and three minor characteristic readings

1. (ስምዑ ፡ ...) ዘገብረ ፡ ... ተአምረ ፡] ዘገብረ ፡ ዐብየ ፡ መንክረ ፡ E²W
2. ወሰዶ ፡] ለወልዳ ፡ add. E²W
3. ተንሥኦ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ሕዋን ፡] ተንሥኦ ፡ ሕዋን ፡ E²W.

Given the special situation of miracle VIII (see above), it is difficult to say if the different stemma codicum that we find in miracles IX to XIII, and which just allows for E² and W going together, already begins in miracle VIII, at least for these two mss., but of course it is probably so.

3. Grouping of the mss. in miracle IX.

The situation of miracles IX-XIII is perhaps less complex, but nevertheless not at all simple. The stemma is different in miracle IX as compared with that of miracles X-XIII, and even these show some minor differences.

3.1. The group CE⁴.

In miracle IX there is a group CE⁴, indicated by the following body of evidence.
At least four conjunctive errors:

1. (a man is telling another the advantages of celebrating the commemoration of some saints) (እምነ ፡ ጸም ፡ ወጸሎት ፡) ውእቶሙ ፡ ይኔይውከ ፡ ወነገሮ ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡ ወገብረ ፡ ተዝካሮሙ ፡] ወነገሮ ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡ ወገብሩ ፡ ተዝካሮሙ ፡ ይኔይውከ ፡ CE⁴;
2. ወተምዕዐት ፡ ብእሲቱ ፡] ወተሰምዐት ፡ በኩሉ ፡ ብእሲቱ ፡ E⁴ ወሶበ ፡ ሰምዐት ፡ ነገሮ ፡ ተምዐት ፡ በኩሉ ፡ (mistake corrected by C);

3. ወተበአው ፡ መላእክተ ፡ ጽልመት ፡ ወመላእክተ ፡ ብርሃን ፡] ወተበአው ፡ ምስለ ፡ መላእክተ ፡ etc. CE⁴;
 4. ወአኀዘ ፡ ረምሐ ፡ ዘመብረቀ ፡ እሳት ፡ ወወረደ ፡ ማእከሎሙ ፡] ወወረደ ፡ om. CE⁴;
- and at least 6 characteristic readings (2 major and 4 minor).

3.2. The group E²W.

In this miracle also a group E²W can be identified.

Six conjunctive errors:

1. ወነገሮ ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡] ወግበር ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡ E²W;
2. ወይቤሎሙ ፡ ... እከውን ፡ ለባሕቲትክሙ ፡] ወይቤሎሙ ፡ ... በከመ ፡ እከውንክሙ ፡ E²W;
3. ወይቤሎ ፡ ... ለእመ ፡ ኮንክ ፡ ለባሕቲትኅ ፡ ንሣእ ፡ ... ዘንተ ፡ ኅብስተ ፡] ለእመ ፡ om. E²W;
4. (ወእምድኅሬነሂ ፡) ሀሎ ፡ ዘየዐብ ፡ እምኪያነ ፡ ... (ውእቱ ፡ ይቀትለክ) ፡] om. E²W (without ሀሎ ፡ ዘየዐብ ፡ እምኪያነ ፡, i. e. GMQ, where it is not clear who is the killer);
5. (two mistakes) ወመሐለ ፡ ... ከመ ፡ ይኩን ፡ ለባሕቲቶሙ ፡] ወሀለወ ፡ ... ከመ ፡ ይኩን ፡ ለባሕቲቱ ፡ E²W;
6. መላእክተ ፡ ጽልመት ፡ ወመላእክተ ፡ ብርሃን ፡] መላእክተ ፡ ብርሃን ፡ ወመላእክተ ፡ ብርሃን ፡ E²W;

and 11 characteristic readings (7 major and 4 minor).

3.3. The group LM.

Also a group LM exists. The evidence is the following.

Two conjunctive errors:

1. (ወይቤሎ ፡ አሆ ፡ ፈሪሆ ፡) ወመሰሎ ፡ ከመ ፡ ዘይሰይፎ ፡] እከውን ፡ ለባሕቲትክ ፡ LM;
2. ወይኩኑ ፡ በሃማነ ፡] ወይኩኑ ፡ በከመ ፡ ትቤ ፡ (GMQ, to whom God is speaking, had said before: እግዚእየ ፡ ባክ ፡ ፍኖትየ ፡ እትሜጠው ፡ ገባሬ ፡ ተዝካርየ ፡);

and 4 characteristic readings (3 major and 1 minor).

3.4. The group E¹V².

Also a group E^1V^2 exists, with no conjunctive error but with some major characteristic readings.

Six major characteristic readings (no minor characteristic reading):

1. አመክረኒ ፡] ምክረኒ ፡ E^1V^2 ;
2. በምንት ፡ ግብር ፡ እጸድቅ ፡] ግብር ፡ om. E^1V^2 ;
3. ወነገሮ ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡] ወነገሮሙ ፡ በዓሎሙ ፡ E^1 (ወነገሮ ፡ $E^1[II]V^2$ (error, but possibly polygenetic);
4. ወልብውኒ ፡ ስርግው ፡ ወይትባረፅ ፡ ከመ ፡ ፀሐይ ፡] ወልብውኒ ፡ ይትባረፅ ፡ ከመ ፡ ፀሐይ ፡ E^1 ወልብውኒ ፡ ከመ ፡ ፀሐይ ፡ V^2 ;
5. ወይቤሎ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡] ወይቤሎ ፡ ለብእሲ ፡ V^2 ወይቤሎ ፡ E^1 ;
6. ወይቤሎ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡] ብእሲ ፡ om. E^1V^2 .

4. Grouping of the mss. in miracles X-XIII.

Beginning with miracle X things change abruptly. The couple CE^4 disappears, in favor of a group CE^2W ; the group E^1V^2 also disappears, and a new group E^4V^2 appears in miracles XII and XIII. The group LM seems to be maintained. Inside the group CE^2W , there seems to be a sub-group E^2W , although the existence of a sub-group CW in miracles XI and XII, contrasting with E^2W , cannot be excluded categorically (but not in the opinion of the present writer).

4.1. The group CE^2W .

Miracle X

4 conjunctive errors:

1. መሐር ፡ ሊተ ፡ በከመ ፡ ኪዳንክ ፡] om. CE^2W (no homoeoteleuton);
2. መሐር ፡ ሊተ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ እምኩሉ ፡ የዐብ ፡ ኪዳን ፡ ቃልክ ፡] መሐር ፡ ሊተ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ እምውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ የዐብ ፡ ኪዳንክ ፡ C መሐር ፡ ሊተ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ወኩሉ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ ዘየዐብ ፡ ኪዳንክ ፡ E^2 መሐር ፡ ሊተ ፡ እምውእቱ ፡ ብእሲ ፡ የዐብ ፡ ኪዳንክ ፡ W;
3. ወይቤሎ ፡ እግዚእነ ፡ ለአቡነ ፡ ገ"መ"ቅ" ፡ ምንተ ፡ ትፈቅድ ፡ እግበር ፡ ለከ ፡ ወይቤሎ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ለእግዚአ ፡ ለእመ ፡ ፈቀድክ ፡ ትግባእ ፡ ነፍው ፡ ውሰተ ፡ ሥጋሁ ፡] ምንተ ፡ — ለእግዚአ ፡ om. CE^2W ;
4. See below, Group CW;
plus 16 characteristic readings.

Miracle XI

2 conjunctive errors:

1. ወጠየቀ : ለእመ : ኮነ : ተዝካራ : በጸም :] ወጠየቀ : መካነ : ተዝካራ : በጸም : CE²W;
2. (ሶበ : ርእዩ : ዐንበሳ : ወነምር : ... ወሰረራ : ሐጹረ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን :) ወካልአሙ : ገብአ : ውስተ : ቤተ : መቅደስ :] om. CE²W;
plus 7 characteristic readings (3 major and 4 minor).

Miracle XII

No conjunctive error, and only one major characteristic reading (this miracle is fairly short):

- ወርእዩ : መቃብሪሁ : ርኅወ :] ወከርሁ : ሥጡጠ : add. CE²W;
plus two other minor characteristic readings.

Miracle XIII

4 conjunctive errors:

1. ኢሰተይኩ : ማዩ : ወኢበላዕኩ : ገብስተ :] ገብስተ : om. CE²W;
2. (ወሰአልሲ : ለእግዚአብሔር : እንዘ : ይብሉ :) ንግር : ለእመ : ኮነ : እሙነ : ኩሉ : እለ : ተጸርጉ : ይንግሩ :] ከመ : ይንግሩ : ለእመ : ኮነ : እሙነ : ዝኩሉ : ንግር : ወይጸርጉ : C ከመ : ይንግሩ : ለእመ : ኮነ : እሙነ : ኩሉ : ተጸርጉ : E² ይንግሩ : ለእመ : ኮነ : እሙነ : መተጸርጉ : ኩሉ : W;
3. ወይእተ : ጊዜ : ይቤ : እግዚእነ :] ይቤ : om. CE²W;
4. ለዘአጽሐፊ : ዘንተ : ተላምረ :) አነ : እጽሕፍ : ሰሞ : ውስተ : መጽሐፈ : ሕይወት : ይረክብ : ማኅደረ : (በመንግሥተ : ሰማያት :)] ለዘያጽሕፎ : ለዝንቱ : መጽሐፍ : ሕይወት : ይረክብ : ወማኅደረ : E² ዘያጽሕፎ : ለዝንቱ : መጽሐፍ : ሕይወት : ይረክብ : ወማኅደረ : W ወለዘአጽሐፎ : ለዝንቱ : መጽሐፍ : ይረክብ : ሕይወት : ወማኅደረ : C;

plus 16 characteristic readings (8 major, among which one with very strong conjunctive value, and 7 minor).

To these readings the following must also be added. They unite only CW, but as E² is wanting for about one third of this miracle, and these readings cover precisely this space, one must admit that they were common also to E², if this long passage existed also in this manuscript. There are 2 conjunctive errors:

1. ወመጽአ : ፲፪ነብያት : ፲ወ፭ሐዋርያት : (ወመጽአ : ኩሎሙ : ሰማዕታት :)] ወመጽአ : ፲ወ፭መላእክተ : ብርሃን : CW;
2. እምቀዳሚ : ሰማዕት : እስጢፋኖስ : (እስከ : ጴጥሮስ :)] ቀዳሚ : እስጢፋኖስ : CW;

and 5 characteristic readings (3 major and 2 minor).

4.2. The sub-group E²W.

As has been said, a sub-group E^2W seems to appear very clearly only in miracles X and XIII.

Miracle X:

one conjunctive error: ከሐድ ፡ ሰማየ ፡ መንበሮ ፡ ወምድረ ፡ መከየደ ፡ እገሪሁ ፡] ሰማየ ፡ ወምድረ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ከሐድ ፡ E^2W ;

with 7 characteristic readings (6 major and 1 minor).

Miracle XIII

2 conjunctive errors:

1. አንሰ ፡ ነበርኩ ፡ ፤፻፳፱ወ፪ዓመተ ፡ (እምአመ ፡ ወጸእኩ ፡ እምከርሠ ፡ እምየ ፡)] ነበርኩ ፡ om. E^2W
2. (ለዘአጽሐፊ ፡ ዘንተ ፡ ተአምረ ፡) አነ ፡ እጽሐፍ ፡ ሰሞ ፡ ውስተ ፡ መጽሐፈ ፡ ሕይወት ፡ ይረክብ ፡ ማኅደረ ፡ (በመንግሥተ ፡ ሰማያት ፡)] ለዘያጽሕፎ ፡ ለዝንቱ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡ ሕይወተ ፡ ይረክብ ፡ ወማኅደረ ፡ E^2 ዘያጽሕፎ ፡ ለዝንቱ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡ ሕይወተ ፡ ይረክብ ፡ ወማኅደረ ፡ W (ወለዘአጽሐፎ ፡ ለእንቱ ፡ መጽሐፍ ፡ ይረክብ ፡ ሕይወተ ፡ ወማኅደረ ፡ C , cp. above CE^2W , conjunctive errors);

plus one minor characteristic reading.

Miracle XI

no material at all for a classification of a group E^2W .

Miracle XII

one conjunctive error: (ወረከቦ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡ አፍአ ፡ መቃበር ፡) ወርእዮ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ቀሲስ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡ (ወሰረረ ፡ ሳለ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡)] om. E^2W . (It is true that this passage is also very confused in other mss., in which also parts of this sentence are wanting).

There is also one minor characteristic reading: ወበልዖ ፡ በጊዜ ፡ ጀሰዓት ፡] ወበልዖ ፡ ወበጊዜ ፡ ጀሰዓት ፡ E^2W .

4.3. The sub-group CW .

The existence of a sub-group CW , contrasting with E^2W because of the fact of having ms. W in common, could be suspected in miracles X, XI and XII. This suspicion could be encouraged by the fact that, as we have seen, evidence for a sub-group E^2W is not so clear in miracles XI and XII. But it is probably not so. Apart from the fact that no conjunctive error uniting C and W is present in miracles XI and XII, in each case of concordance between C and W , a presence of E^2

can also be admitted, with a subsequent change peculiar only to this manuscript; the same can be said for the other mss. also.

Miracle X

Here the existence of a sub-group CW is difficult to admit because of the assured existence of E²W. It would be characterized by the following conjunctive error: ወይቤሎ : እግዚእነ : ... ምንተ : ትፈቅድ : እግበር : ለከ : ወይቤሎ : አቡነ : ለእግዚአብሔር : ለእመ : ፈቀድከ : ትግባእ : ነፍው : ውስተ : ሥጋሁ :] ወይቤሎ : አቡነ : እው : እግዚእየ : post ወሥጋሁ : add. CW, but it can be admitted that it is common to CE²W, and that E² has corrected it subsequently. The other error by CW is an homoeoteleuton, and as such polygenetic: መሰልኪኑ : ትነብሪ : እስከ : ለዓለም ። መመሰልኪኑ : ዘአልብኪ : ሞተ :] ትነብሪ : — ለዓለም : om. CW (homoeoteleuton).

There is also a major characteristic reading: ወዘበጦ : በውእቱ : እብን : ናላሁ :] ወዘበጦ : በውእቱ : እብን : ወፈቅዶ : ናላሁ : CW, which can be interpreted also as a common reading CE²W with ወፈቅዶ : eliminated subsequently by E² by mere error on its part inside the group. There is also a minor characteristic reading: ወይቤሎ : ... ዳግመ : ክሕድኩ :] om. ዳግመ : CW, but this is too scarce an evidence on which to build a branch, and besides the passage is full of other cases of ክሕድ : /ክሕድኩ : , and another ዳግም : .

Miracle XI

As has been said, all the major characteristic readings are doubtful, as all of them are explicable by an original reading common also to E²:

1. ወነበረ : እስከ : ዕለተ : ልደቱ : ወአምጽአ : ላህመ : ወበግዕ :] ወዘንተ : ብሂሎ : ጸረ : ውስተ : ቤቱ : ወአምጽአ : በዕለተ : ተዝካሩ : ላህመ : ወበግዕ : W ወዘንተ : ብሂሎ : ጸረ : እንዘ : ይጸንሕ : እስከ : ዕለተ : በዓሉ : ወአምጽአ : በዕለተ : ተዝካሩ : ላህመ : ወበግዕ : C. In E² ወዘንተ : — ተዝካሩ : is wanting, but it is an homoeoteleuton because of another ላህመ : ወበግዕ : which precedes ወዘንተ : ;
2. ንግሩ : ትእምርትየ : ወይክሥት : አምላኪየ : ልሳነ :] ወእምዝ : ተሰወረ : እምኔሆሙ : add. CW (the saint is speaking to a lion and a leopard); a very common sentence, which can explain the reading by polygenesis;
3. ወይቤሎሙ : ... ለእለ : ሀለዉ : ውስተ : ቤተ : መቅደስ : (ንሥኡ : ላህመ : ወበግዕ :)] ወይቤሎሙ : ... ለሕዝብ : ለካህናት : ወለዲያቆናት : አንትሙ : እለ : (ለ — C) ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : CW ወይቤሎሙ : ... እለ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : E². The elimination of ለሕዝብ : — አንትሙ : could be an initiative of E²: that all three mss. go together is demonstrated by the irregular እለ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : , which is almost incomprehensible;

4. ከመዝ : ተናገሩ : ከመ : ሰብእ :] እሎንቱ : አንበሳ : ወነምር : add. C እሎ : አንበሳ : ወነምር : add. C. The elimination of this addition could be an initiative of E² only;
5. ወረከቡ : ... በአንቀጸ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : ላህመ : ወበግዕ :] ወነበሩ : etc. CW. It is almost an error, but E² omits the passage ወረከቡ :/ወነበሩ : — ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : , most probably by way of homoeoteleuton, because CW, and presumably E², have ቤተ : መቅደስ : instead of ቤተ : ክርስቲያን : , and ቤተ : መቅደስ : is also present immediately before ወረከቡ :/ወነበሩ : ;
6. ወበልዑ : እስከ : ጀሰሙን :] post ወበልዑ : add. ሐሪዶሙ : CW. The elimination of ሐሪዶሙ : could be an initiative of E², because of a linguistic taboo (“and having butchered [them]”).

The same holds true for the minor characteristic readings:

1. ወሰምዐ : መጽሐፈ :] ወሰምዐ : እንዘ : ይትነበብ : መጽሐፈ : CW. E² cannot insert እንዘ : ይትነበብ : because instead of ወሰምዐ : “he heard” it has ወሰዐመ : “he kissed”;
2. ውስዱ : (object: a sheep and a cow, already mentioned) ውስተ : ቤተ : ክርስቲያን :] ላህመ : ወበግዕ : add. W. ንሥኡ : ላህመ : ወበግዕ : add. C. Two hypotheses are possible: either E² has simply eliminated a redundant indication, or the sub-archetype had a reading like that of C, a real mistake, improved by W, and eliminated altogether by E²;
3. እመንቱ : ሰብእ : ሀገር :] ኩሉ : ሰብእ : C ኩሎሙ : ሰብእ : W. Only ሰብእ : in E², which could have omitted ኩሉ :/ኩሎሙ : because of an individual initiative.

Miracle XII

For a possible sub-group CW, more or less the same can be said as in miracle XI. There is no conjunctive error, and all the characteristic readings can be interpreted as an original reading of CE²W, with E² innovating inside its group.

Major characteristic readings:

1. ወበልዎ : በጊዜ : ጀሰዓት :] ወሐረዶ : ወበልዎ : በጊዜ : ጀሰዓት : ወነጥእሲ : CW. E² eliminates ወሐረዶ : and ወነጥእሲ : on its own initiative (the first [“he butchered it”] maybe for reasons of taboos as above, XI:6);
2. ወሐዘነ :] ወበከዩ : add. CW. Idem;
3. ወእእመረ : ዘከመ : በልዎ :] ሰራቂ : ወኖመ : add. CW (the text speaks of a thief who has stolen and eaten a chicken; during the night, the owner of the chicken hears its cry). Idem;
4. (ወርእዩ : መቃበሪሁ : ርኅወ :) ወረከቡ : ክፋተ :] ወከርሡ : ርኅወ : CW. Here E² is illegible.

Minor characteristic readings

1. (ወርእየ ፡) መቃብሪያ ፡ (ርኅወ ፡)] መቃብሪያ ፡ ለሰራቂ ፡ CW. Here again E² is illegible.

4.4. The group LM.

The existence of a group LM is based on the following evidence.

Miracle X

No conjunctive error. Two major characteristic readings:

1. (የዐብ ፡ ኪዳንዮ ፡ ወፍቁረ ፡ ዚአክ ፡) ኦፍቂርዮ ፡] ፍቁርዮ ፡ አንተ ፡ LM
(almost an error);
 2. (ወይቤሎ ፡ አቡነ ፡ ቅድመሰ ፡ ነበርኩ ፡) ምእመነክ ፡] ምእመነ ፡ LM;
- and 4 minor characteristic readings.

Miracle XI

Two conjunctive errors:

1. (ወነበረ ፡ እስከ ፡ ዕለተ ፡ ልደቱ ፡) ወአምጽእ ፡ ላህመ ፡ ወበግዑ ፡ እንዘ ፡ ይወስድ ፡ ኀበ ፡ ቤተ ፡ ክርስቲያን ፡ ወረከበ ፡ በፍኖት ፡ ጀአንበሳ ፡] ወአምጽእ ፡ — በፍኖት ፡ om. LM;
2. (ወበግዕዚ ፡ ተመሲሎ ፡ ከመ ፡ እንተ ፡ አድግ ፡) እምብዝነ ፡ ገዝፈት ፡] ዕበዩ ፡ ወግዘፍሙ ፡ L አዕበዩ ፡ ግዝፈ ፡ M;

plus 5 characteristic readings (3 major and 2 minor).

Miracle XII

The existence of this group relies on very scanty evidence: no conjunctive error and no major characteristic reading. Only two minor characteristic readings:

1. ወወጽኡ ፡ ከሎሙ ፡] ሰብእ ፡ ሀገር ፡ add. LM
2. ወርእይሲ ፡ ለውእቱ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡] ወርእይሲ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡ LM.

Miracle XIII

Two conjunctive errors:

1. (በዕለተ ፡ ሞቱ ፡ ዘገብረ ፡) በከዩ ፡ ጅአናብስት ... ወበከዩ ፡ አድባር ፡] በከዩ ፡ om. LM
 2. ወጸእኩ ፡ እምከርሠ ፡ እምየ ፡ (ወኢለከፈኒ ፡ እራሳ ፡)] ወጸእኩ ፡ LM;
- plus 7 characteristic readings (3 major and 4 minor).

4.5. The group E^4V^2 .

The group E^4V^2 seems to exist only in miracles XII-XIII.

Miracle XII

One conjunctive error: ወበጊዜ ፡ መንፈቀ ፡ ሌሊት ፡ ነቀወ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡
... ወሰምዐ ፡ በዓለ ፡ ዶርሆ ፡ ወአእመረ ፡ ዘከመ ፡ በልዖ ፡ (እስከ ፡ ይጽብሕ ፡
ሌሊት ፡ ወሞተ ፡ ውእቱ ፡ ሰራቂ ፡)] ወጎድኣ ፡ add. E^4 ወጎጉኣ ፡ add. V^2 (it
is clear that there is no space for verbs like “to knock” or “to hurry”);
plus two major characteristic readings.

Miracle XIII

Two conjunctive errors:

1. ወአንተ ፡ እግዚአ ፡ ዘተአምር ፡ ... ንግር ፡] ወአንተ ፡ እግዚአ ፡ ዘተአምሩ ፡ ...
ንግራ ፡ E^4V^2
2. እንዘ ፡ ይብሉ ፡] om. ይብሉ ፡ E^4V^2

plus two characteristic readings (one major and one minor).

The results of this second part are very clear, although, to my mind, fairly complex. If we take into account (as was stressed at the beginning of this paper) the principle of conjunctive errors, as is done in every sound “neo-Lachmannian” method (instead of that of marginal similarities, which is still so widespread in Ethiopian studies), we realize that the manuscript tradition of the Miracles is precisely the opposite of that of the Life: whereas the latter was stable and univocal, the former is extremely composite and diversified, not only with different groups from one miracle to another (miracles I, II-VII, VIII, IX, X-XIII; see above and the conclusions, below), but also inside the same miracle (miracle VII; see above). What this can mean from the cultural point of view is difficult to tell at present, as was said at the beginning of this paper, but it is clear that we can draw at this point two important conclusions. The first is that we are confronted here with a well-known phenomenon, the difference between the redaction of the “Life” and that of the “Miracles” in a *gadd*, which in the present case, far from being a working hypothesis, has been *philologically demonstrated* in the most evident way. The second is that the cultural interlacement, or even the interplay, of the different scribal and monastic traditions is even more complex than could have been imagined before. This is also demonstrated, in our case, by clear philological data, instead of being supposed on the basis of mere historical considerations, which in many instances are rather generic and uncertain in character. Our general conclusion cannot be different from the statement that philology has given us a clear and, so to

speaking, aseptic indication, fully in keeping with its true nature, towards the interpretation of historical and cultural phenomena of paramount importance.

III Conclusions

In short, the genealogical tree of the manuscripts in the “Miracles” of Gabra Manfas Qeddus can be summarized as follows.

a. According to the Miracles:

1. Miracle I: $A^1V^1W(V^1W) A^2E^5 B^2CE^4L E^1V^2$
2. Miracles II to VII: $A^1V^1W(V^1W) B^1CE^4M(CE^4) A^2E^5E^1V^2$ (documented only in miracles V and VII)
3. In the miracle VII, towards the end of the first half, the groups B^1CE^4M and A^2E^5 disappear, and a group A^2CE^4 appears instead.
4. Miracle VIII (Nāʾod): $E^2W E^1V^2$
5. Miracle IX: $E^2W CE^4 LM E^1V^2$
6. Miracles X to XIII: $CE^2W(E^2W) LM E^4V^2$ (attested only in miracles XI-XII)

b. According to the manuscripts:

1. $A^1V^1W(V^1W)$ Miracles I-VII
2. B^2CE^4L Miracle I
3. $B^1CE^4M(CE^4)$ Miracles II to VII (A^2CE^4 in part of VII)
4. A^2E^5 Miracles I to VII (A^2CE^4 in part of VII)
5. E^1V^2 Miracles I, V, VII, VIII
6. E^2W Miracles VIII, IX
7. $CE^2W(E^2W)$ Miracles X to XIII
8. CE^4 Miracle IX
9. LM Miracles IX to XIII
10. E^1V^2 Miracles IX, XII, XIII

Summary

The philological examination of the genealogical tree of the “Miracles” of Gabra Manfas Qeddus, based of course on the principle of conjunctive errors and not on that of marginal similarities, has shown two important phenomena: 1. that not just one, but at least six different stemmas (for miracles I, II-VII, VIII, IX, X-XIII) can be identified; and 2. that none of these stemmas has the slightest relationship with those already identified for the “Life”. This involves an important historical consequence, because it demonstrates the profound difference, which has always been supposed in hagiography, between the redaction of the “Life” and that of the “Miracles” of the same saint.